PERSUASION

published by
PERSUASION, INC.
260 west 86 street, n.y.c.

35¢

JOAN KENNEDY TAYLOR, EDITOR

distributed by the
Metropolitan Young Republican Club

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PERSUASION

published by
PERSUASION, INC.
260 west 86 street, n.y.c.

35¢

JOAN KENNEDY TAYLOR, EDITOR

distributed by the
Metropolitan Young Republican Club

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Volume I, No. 1 September 10, 1964

V I E W S

IT COULDN'T HAPPEN HERE

There are two main forms of collectivism. In one, private property is expropriated, nationalized, and is then administered by representatives of the state. In the other, the framework of private ownership is preserved, but it is subject to almost total government control. Both of these require a tremendous concentration of power in the executive branch of government, which runs the economy.

The former brand of collectivism is called socialism or communism. The latter is fascism, and is the collectivist system most likely to succeed in the United States.

It is most likely to succeed precisely because the form of private property is not touched, and Americans like to think that they are defenders of private property. Our railroads are not nationalized, they are privately owned. But who now decides where they run, when service can be discontinued, what fares and freight

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rates are charged, and what companies can merge? A regulatory agency of the government. Suppose all industries and business in the country were subject to the same amount of regulation as the railroads--would we then suspect that we had a fascist economy? If we are able to differentiate between the economics of fascism and the racism and terror that have become so associated with it politically, we can see that we would have to answer yes to that question. As former Federal Trade Commissioner Lowell Mason said in his book, The Language of Dissent:

"People who favor the present growth of bureaucratic power are prone to think the total state comes only through a reign of terror."

All it takes is a leader--someone who can appeal to all groups in the name of the nation, who can enlist the support of all groups in a drive toward economic centralization.

Let us, as they say in politics, look at the record.

Mussolini came to power in Italy in the 1920's, helped by both business and labor in his fight against "bolshevism." He had wide popular support. The landowning classes were protected by Fascism against outright expropriation, and therefore supported it as an alternative to socialization. "On the other hand," says The Columbia Encyclopedia, "the state adopted a paternalistic attitude toward labor, improving its conditions in some respects, reducing unemployment through large public works and an armaments program." Mussolini set up a "corporate state" which substituted regulated sectors of the economy for political parties.

In 1933, Adolf Hitler was appointed Chancellor of Germany. He too was a dedicated enemy of communism, and presented his approach as the "modern" alternative to socialization. Hitler, like Mussolini, found a way to appeal to both capital and labor, and rose to power legally. He had been supported by some businessmen since the '20's, and, says The Columbia Encyclopedia, "Although the state took control of the entire national economy, the owners of private enterprise continued to reap benefits." Labor unions were abolished. But William Shirer reports that when he was working in Germany in 1936, "one heard workers who had been deprived of their trade-union rights joking, over their full dinner pails, that at least under Hitler there was no more freedom to starve."

It is against this background that we want to examine President Johnson's concept of "the great society" which he has asked for a mandate to begin. In his acceptance speech before the Democratic Convention, he characterized it only as "a place where the meaning of man's life matches the marvels of man's labor," which is hardly a definition. In that same speech, however, he lists "the goals toward which I will lead," and these include medical care for the aged, "fair and stable prices" for the farmer, housing, education, "a job for every man who wants to work," "victory in our war against poverty," and prosperity.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

How is he going to lead us? Who is going to provide these things? Well, we have to have the courage to "welcome the future," to realize what true freedom is. "The man who is hungry, who cannot find work or educate his children, who is bowed by want--that man is not fully free."

Obviously, if this is so, the government, which is pledged to support freedom, should provide food, jobs, education for all. And President Johnson apparently has supporters who agree. Big Labor, for one. On September 4, George Meany, President of the AFL-CIO, said in a speech in Washington that jobs must come from "a massive Federal investment in America--an investment in education, in health, in all lines of needed public facilities."

Columnists seem to agree that what President Johnson wants is a "consensus," and he seems to be getting it. Businessmen are also coming out for Johnson, in ever-increasing numbers. Robert G. Spivack, in his column of August 9 tried to explain why. There are "many areas where business firms were largely reliant on government aid for financial help or rate-fixing," he points out, and also, "Millions of jobs in civilian industry are now dependent on government purchases, or subsidies, ranging from the Defense establishment to the pharmaceutical industry to clothing manufacturers. If there are any businessmen who say they are ready to 'go it alone' without some form of government aid, they are singularly quiet about it," says Mr. Spivack, who obviously considers this support a feather in Johnson's cap.

So we can expect big federal programs to appeal to Big Labor, and big federal purchasing and subsidies to appeal to Big Business in the great society. Will we also have a Big Leader to help us decide what to do?

Some repercussions from the Democratic Convention suggest that this too may be in store for us. Certainly, newsmen of whatever political persuasion could not keep from showing surprise at the absolute control that Johnson had over his party. Joseph Alsop reported that the scripts for all speeches to the Convention or to the platform committee had to be submitted to the White House, and "according to report, President Johnson himself then personally reviewed and amended every part of the script except the more boring brief orations introducing lengthy orators." And this was the man who "impulsively" rushed to Atlantic City before his own nomination to tell the Convention that he had "found" the right man to be Vice-President, and then said in his acceptance speech, "I thank you for placing at my side the man you so wisely selected to be the next Vice-President of the United States--Senator Hubert Humphrey."

And no one laughed.

But surely this sort of control could never be exerted over the country, could it? After all, the incumbent president is traditionally the head of his party. But on the National scene, Congress is a check on executive power. Isn't it?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Douglas Kiker of the New York Herald Tribune staff wrote on August 27, "Suddenly it seemed that there was no piece of legislation Mr. Johnson couldn't get through Congress, in one form or another, if he set his mind to it. His theory is simple and classic: Congressmen vote their own interests, and it is up to him to persuade them--through threats to punish, through promise to reward, through cajolery, through dogged insistence, or through brute force--to conclude that it is in their interest to vote his way. Today the President likes to sit and, counting on his fingers for emphasis, tick off his record of legislative accomplishment made during these last nine months."

Now wait a minute. Threats? Promises to reward? Brute force? This is somehow not the American legislative process which we studied in school. Do we still claim it couldn't happen here?

The Republican candidate for President is aware of the issues. On September 4 at Prescott, Arizona, Senator Goldwater said, "The leadership of this present Administration, which seeks this concentration of power as an announced article of its political faith, becomes the natural ally of all in our society who would monopolize power, centralize power, manipulate power, and grow rich from power. This applies across the board, from the advocates of big government, to the bosses of big labor, to the bosses of big-city politics, as well as to those who would abuse great economic power in business. Facing the power seekers is the lone man, the citizen, the forgotten man whose rights our Government was designed to make secure."

How long are people going to be able to pretend that they don't know what he's talking about?

And that is why the Metropolitan Young Republican Club has adopted as its slogan for this campaign:

STOP THE DRIFT TO FASCISM--VOTE GOLDWATER!

--Joan Kennedy Taylor

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

R E V I E W S

THE GOLDWATER TRIO

With the candidacy of Senator Barry Goldwater for President of the United States, his books are once again in the public eye.

In The Conscience of a Conservative (written in 1960) Senator Goldwater sets forth his basic political credo--his views on big government, States' Rights, civil rights, the "farm problem," labor, taxes, the Welfare State, education and, most importantly, his views on foreign policy. The Senator, in all these areas, reaffirms the principle of limited government and individual freedom under the Constitution, and sees the overriding political challenge for Conservatives as the preservation and extension of freedom, on both the domestic scene and in foreign policy. In a country where collectivism is the dominant trend, this position is indeed a hopeful sign.

In commenting on the perils of power, Senator Goldwater states: "Throughout history, government has proved to be the chief instrument for thwarting man's liberty." He is a staunch advocate of States' Rights and views the government's failure to recognize the Constitutional line between federal and state jurisdiction as "a crushing blow to the principle of limited government." The principle of States' Rights governs Senator Goldwater's position on several domestic issues. He sees the issue of civil rights as an attempt "to disparage the principle of States' Rights by equating it with the defense of the South's position on racial integration." In the field of education, he believes that any federal intervention into the field of education will lead to--and has already led to--federal control of education. Education, he states, "is one of the powers reserved to the States under the Tenth Amendment" to the Constitution, and should be kept there. One difficulty of this position is that it does not make clear what protects the rights of the individual from the encroachment of the state government as opposed to the federal government.

The Senator makes a similar omission in the field of labor. Although he sees danger in the enormous economic and political power of Big Labor today, he does not analyse the extent to which it was the federal government which granted that power. His solution to the problem is therefore to put unions under the anti-trust laws, thereby giving the federal government even greater power over the economy of our nation.

Despite some specific positions which may be questioned, Senator Goldwater is still the best representative we have of individual freedom. This is remarkably demonstrated in his views on foreign policy, both in this book and in Why Not Victory? published in 1962.

"We are at war," states Senator Goldwater in his second book; "not a cold war

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but a real war...war of a more deadly nature than any we have fought before..." and he suggests that we design our national strategy to achieve victory. He points to the failure of our current foreign policy of accommodation and appeasement, which has resulted in weakness and indecision in our dealings with the Communists. America, he goes on to say, possesses the greatest military power in the world today, yet since World War II "we began to lean over backward and to gear our policies to the opinions of others....Foreign aid, deference to the United Nations, and cultural exchange programs, exchange visits of American and Soviet functionaries, summit conferences, the nuclear-test ban, advocacy of general disarmament, anti-colonialism, the refusal to intervene early enough in Cuba, the establishment of world government--all of those programs and postures have a single common denominator: an effort to please world opinion." Instead we have earned world contempt.

He develops this thesis dramatically in chapters on the U-2 incident, the Cuban fiasco, disarmament, the World Court, the United Nations. He urges America to adopt an integrated strategy aimed at victory "that [illegible] the principles of political, military, economic and psychological strength..."

He proposes the following immediate steps to re-orient our policy: 1. We must stop believing our primary objective must be to humor public opinion. 2. We must give up the idea of disarmament. 3. We must not abandon nuclear testing (written before the treaty was signed). 4. We must stop negotiating about things that are non-negotiable, such as the rights of our allies. 5. We must stop helping Communism, whether by trade, concessions or recognition. 6. We must avoid economic collapse by scaling down our domestic programs.

Why Not Victory? is a brilliant analysis of American foreign policy, presented eloquently and logically. To the extent to which this book outlines a foreign policy that Senator Goldwater would follow if elected President, there is reason to hope that he would lead the free world back to a position of unrivaled power and pride.

Senator Goldwater's latest book, Where I Stand (1964, McGraw-Hill Paperbacks), is a collection of previous speeches and his "position papers" which express his stand on the issues. This stand has changed in some details since he wrote The Conscience of a Conservative, but, although he may sometimes contradict a specific previous interpretation of an issue, he has not expressed any compromise on the principles of limited government and individual freedom. His acceptance speech before the Republican National Convention opens the book and is an inspiring call for unity and determination in the fight for world freedom. He writes, "This Party, with its every action, every word, every breath, and every heartbeat, has but a single resolve: Freedom!"

His speeches before the Senate during the debates on the limited nuclear test ban treaty and the civil rights act of 1964 are also given in this book. He expands

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his views on foreign policy, the arms race, the economics of freedom. This book is surprisingly hard to read. It doesn't build up any continuity because the chapters are taken from so many different sources.

Whether or not one agrees with Senator Goldwater's specific position on the issues he covers, no one reading these three books can doubt the fact that here is a man devoid of the desire for personal power. He is a strong supporter of the Constitution and the rule of law, and wishes to reduce the power of government in general and the power of the Executive Branch in particular.

--Elenore Boddy

P E R S U A S I O N

* * * * *

How should one answer charges that Senator Goldwater is "trigger happy" and a "warmonger"? Perhaps the best way is by quoting the Senator's own words on September 4 in Prescott, Arizona:

"A major concern of ours has been the military security of this nation. Some distort this proper concern to make it appear that we are preoccupied with war.

"There is no greater political lie.

"We are preoccupied with peace.

"And we are fearful that this Administration is letting the peace slip away, as it has slipped three times since 1914, by pretending that there are no threats to it.

"I am trying to carry to the American people this plain message: This entire nation and the entire world risks war in our time unless free men remain strong enough to keep the peace.

"This Administration, which inherited the mightiest arsenal for the defense of freedom ever created on earth, is so dismantling it that we face the prospect of going into the decade of the nineteen-seventies with only a fraction of the flexible, balanced weapon systems which give us the vital options of controlled, graduated deterence--rather than only a capacity for all-out nuclear confrontation...

"The Republican Party is the peace party.

"We are the peace party because we understand the enemy. We understand his aims. We understand that he always has and always will take risks and seek advantages when tempted by weakness.

"We seek a strong America because only a strong nation can keep the peace.

"I do not intend to be a wartime President....

"I do not intend to see peace and freedom torn away from this nation because we lack will, weapons, or leadership.

"I promise an administration that will keep the peace--and keep faith with freedom at the same time."

One would think that those Americans who admired President Kennedy would remember that when he stood firm in the Cuban missile crisis and directly held the Soviet Union responsible for Cuban

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

policy, the result was not war. The result was accommodation on the part of the Soviet Union, and world-wide acclaim for President Kennedy's courage. This is the sort of stand that Senator Goldwater thinks this country should take consistently.

* * * * *

An article in the New York Times by Will Lissner last month is well worth citing in arguments about the "practical" aspect of taxation.

Mr. Lissner quotes Walter Hoving, chairman of Tiffany & Co. and also chairman of the Anti-4 Per Cent Sales Tax Committee, as charging that the increase in the city sales tax from 3 to 4 per cent has decreased the total sales tax receipts, as retail sales had been "almost $400 million behind last year, while the rest of the nation has been booming."

This, in the face of the World's Fair and the extra business it was supposed to bring to the city.

Why did business decline? Smaller stores, said Mr. Hoving, that did not do non-taxable, out-of-town business, "have been going bankrupt by the dozens every week."

* * * * *

The New York Herald Tribune on August 28 quoted excerpts from Robert Kennedy's address to the Democratic Convention (the national one).

"He quoted from Robert Frost: 'The woods are dark and deep, but I have miles to go before I sleep, and promises to keep, and promises to keep.'" says Richard L. Maddon in a dispatch from Atlantic City.

We never really worried much about the so-called carpetbagging issue, but now we are concerned. Are residents of New York State really willing to see as their Senator a man who misquotes Robert Frost?

As every school child should know, the original verse goes: "...But I have promises to keep, And miles to go before I sleep, And miles to go before I sleep."

Intellectuals: If Mr. Kennedy misquotes a man who was a family friend in this way, what will he do to his enemies? His version doesn't even scan.

To lovers of poetry, we think nothing more need be said.

* * * * *

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED